

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
(Case No. 01-1015)**

In the Application of:)
Raman et al.) **Examiner: Alicia Baturay**
Serial No.: 10/004,116) **Group Art Unit: 2446**
Filed: November 2, 2001) **Confirmation No.: 8024**
For: Method and System for Load Balancing) **Customer No.: 20306**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT OF SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW

Dear Sir:

A telephonic Examiner Interview took place on July 15, 2010. Participants included Examiner Alicia Baturay, Examiner Baturay's supervisor, and Applicants' Representative, Michael Borella. Applicants thank the Examiners for conducting the interview.

The participants again discussed claims 10, 13, and 26, as well as the McLampy reference. No exhibits were shown, no demonstrations were conducted. During the interview, Applicants' representative suggested that McLampy failed to disclose the claim element of a control node receiving incoming calls, if a current call volume is below a threshold value, assigning the incoming calls to a first proxy and a second proxy based on a round robin protocol, and if the current call volume is above the threshold value, assigning the incoming calls to the first proxy and the second proxy based on their respective weights.

While agreement on the claims was not reached, the Examiners suggested that the claims may be allowable if subject matter from claim 28 or claim 29 were amended to include more detail from the specification and then incorporated into the independent claims.

Further, in view of the Interview Summary mailed July 23, 2010, Applicants do not agree that any one claim element was characterized as “critical.” While the “assigning” claim element was the focus of the interview, Applicants do not admit that this element is a critical element.

Respectfully submitted,

McDonnell Boehnen Hulbert & Berghoff LLP

Date: August 2, 2010

By: /Michael S. Borella/
Michael S. Borella
Reg. No. 62,361
Tel. 312-913-3361